

27. The system of claim 24, wherein the first and second address decoders each decode a broadcast address in a broadcast message to be processed by the first and second display devices.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 18, and 21-26 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,349 ("Molloy"). Claims 15-17 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molloy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,155 ("Arai"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1 and 22 each recite two display devices coupled to a common communications channel and receiving over the communications channel portions of their respective video images that have been updated since a previous update. Molloy does not disclose multiple display devices sharing a common communications channel. Further, Molloy does not disclose multiple display devices receiving portional video images over that common communications channel. Molloy's device 26, cited in the rejection as a second display device, is not a display device at all, but a processor that calculates coordinates and transmits those coordinates back to the transmission source for use in the image transmitted to Molloy's only display device 14 (column 5 lines 47-51,

Fig. 1). Molloy's processor 26 is merely a feedback device to communicate in the reverse direction, without any indicated display capability. Claims 2-5, 8-13 depend from claim 1, while claims 15-21, 24-27 depend from claim 22, and thus contain the same limitations not disclosed by Molloy.

In addition to being allowable due to their dependency from claims 1 and 22, the following dependent claims contain additional allowable subject matter for the following reasons:

Claim 10 recites that the updates for the two display devices are formatted differently. Molloy does not disclose any details for formatting the data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 10 is devoted to a discussion of the frequency of the updates, not their format.

Claims 12 and 24 recite using different addresses for the two display devices. Molloy does not disclose anything related to device addresses. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 12 (column 10 lines 11-17) is devoted to a discussion of video receiver 36 that acts as a communications interface for Molloy's only display device 14. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 24 (column 4 lines 7-10) is devoted to a discussion of types of communications channels.

Claim 13 recites time-stamping two separate portions of video data so their presentation in the display device may be synchronized based on the time-stamps. Molloy does not disclose anything related to time-stamping the video data. The portion of Molloy cited in the rejection for claim 13 (column 8 lines 1-4, 34-39) is devoted to a discussion of eliminating lower-priority updates, not of synchronizing the display of both updates based on time-stamp data within the updates.

Claim 15 recites a protocol handler to interpret the video data. The Office action admits that Molloy does not disclose this limitation and cites column 5 lines 49-51 of Arai to provide the limitation missing from Molloy. However, this portion of Arai only discusses the interpretation of a command, not of data protocol. As is well known in the art, data protocol involves how different pieces of data are to be used based on their position with the overall data structure, not on interpreting a single command embedded within that data.

Claim 25 recites the use of different protocols in the video data sent to the two different display devices. Since Molloy does not disclose the use of multiple display devices, Molloy cannot disclose the use of different protocols for each different display device. Further, as previously stated, neither Molloy nor Arai discuss the use of protocols in the data at all. The portion of Arai cited in the rejection (column 4 lines 7-10) is devoted to a discussion of the different types of communications channels, not to a discussion of different data protocols.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 8-13, 15-22, 24-27 are now in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this amendment. If this is

incorrect, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOLOKOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 3-12-02

John Travis

John Travis
Reg. No. 43,203

12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(512) 330-0844

APPENDIX A

Marked-Up Copy of Amended Claims

1. (Amended once) A method of displaying an image, comprising:
transmitting a first portion of first video image data over a communications
channel to a first video memory in a first display device; [and]
transmitting a second portion of second video image data over the
communications channel to a second video memory in a second display
device;
updating the first video memory with the first portion;
updating the second video memory with the second portion;
wherein the first portion contains video data representing a part of the first video
image data that has changed since a previous transmission to the first
display device, and [the first portion] excludes a substantial part of the
first video image data that is unchanged since the previous transmission to
the first display device;
wherein the second portion contains video data representing a part of the second
video image data that has changed since a previous transmission to the
second display device, and excludes a substantial part of the second video
image data that is unchanged since the previous transmission to the second
video display device.

5. (Amended once) The method of claim 4, wherein said irregular intervals are based on detecting a change in the first video image data since [a] the previous transmission to the first display device.
6. (Cancelled)
7. (Cancelled)
8. (Amended once) The method of claim [7] 1, wherein the communications channel is a bus.
9. (Amended once) The method of claim [7] 1, wherein the communications channel is a daisy chain cable.
10. (Amended once) The method of claim [7] 1, wherein the first portion and the second portion are formatted differently.
11. (Amended once) The method of claim [7] 1, wherein the first portion and the second portion are formatted alike.
12. (Amended once) The method of claim [7] 1, wherein the first portion includes an address to identify the first video device and the second portion includes an address to identify the second video device.

13. (Amended once) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
transmitting a [second] third portion of the first video image data to the first
display device;
time-stamping the first and [second] third portions before transmission; and
synchronizing a presentation of the first and [second] third portions based on the
time-stamping.
14. (Cancelled)
15. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim [14] 22, [further
comprising] wherein the first display device includes a protocol handler to interpret the
[received data stream] first video data.
16. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim [14] 22, [further
comprising] wherein the first display device includes a timing generator to generate
timing signals for a display.
17. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim 16, [further comprising]
wherein the first display device includes a control circuit to configure the timing
generator.

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

18. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim [14] 22, [further comprising] wherein the first display device includes a scalar circuit to change a granularity of the video image.
19. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim 18, [further comprising] wherein the first display device includes a control circuit to configure the scalar circuit.
20. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim [14] 22, [further comprising] wherein the first display device includes a display interface to at least one of a CRT and a flat panel.
21. (Amended once) The [display device] system of claim [14] 22, [further comprising] wherein the first display device includes at least one of a CRT and a flat panel.
22. (Amended once) A system [for displaying video images], comprising:
a first display device having a first video memory;
a second display device having a second video memory;
a communications channel coupled to the first and second display devices;
[first and second display devices coupled to the communications channel;] and
a [graphics] video controller coupled to the communications channel to update [a first portion of] a first image displayed by the first display device by transmitting over the communications channel to the first video memory

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

first video data that has changed since a previous update to the first image and by not transmitting a substantial portion of the first video data that has not changed since the previous update to the first image, and to update [a second portion of] a second image displayed by the second display device by transmitting over the communications channel to the second video memory second video data that has changed since a previous update to the second image and by not transmitting a substantial portion of the second video data that has not changed since the previous update to the second image.

23. (Cancelled)

24. (Amended once) The system of claim [23] 22, wherein:

the first display device includes a first address decoder to decode a first device address [in a first message] associated with the first video data received over the communications channel; and

the second display device includes a second address decoder to decode a second device address [in a second message] associated with the second video data received over the communications channel.

25. (Amended once) The system of claim 24, wherein a protocol of the first [message] video data is different than a protocol of the second [message] video data.

Attorney Docket: 042390.P7353

27. (New claim) The system of claim 24, wherein the first and second address decoders are each to decode a broadcast address in a broadcast message to be processed by the first and second display devices.